REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 25-50 are pending in this case. Claims 25 and 38 are amended to correct informalities and with support in the originally filed disclosure at least at paragraphs [0082] to [0085] of the published Specification. Thus, no new matter is added.

In the outstanding Office Action, the Specification was objected to; Claims 25 and 38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Soininen, et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0252674, herein "Soininen") in view of Widegren, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,374,112, herein "Widegren"); Claims 26, 27, 39, and 40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Soininen in view of Widegren, further in view of Chaskar (U.S. Patent No. 7,023,820); Claims 28, 29, 41, and 42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Soininen in view of Widegren, further in view of Kekki (U.S. Pub. No. 2005/0073953); Claims 30 and 43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Soininen in view of Widegren, further in view of Kekki and Chaskar; Claims 31 and 44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Soininen in view of Widegren, further in view of Chaskar and Brouwer (U.S. Patent No. 6,760,303); Claims 32 and 45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Soininen in view of Widegren, further in view of Kekki and Brouwer; Claims 33 and 46 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Soininen in view of Widegren, further in view of Brouwer; Claims 34 and 47 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Soininen in view of Widegren, further in view of Boudreaux (U.S. Patent No. 6,466,556); Claims 35 and 48 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Soininen in view of Widegren, further in view of Boudreaux and Abrams, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,158,508, herein "Abrams"); and Claims 36, 37, 49, and 50 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over

Soininen in view of Widegren, further in view of Davis, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,781,971, herein "Davis").

At the outset, Applicants and Applicants' representative thank Supervisory Patent Examiner Shah and Examiner Shivers for the courtesy of an interview with Applicants' representative on January 8, 2010. The discussion during that interview is substantially repeated herein.

In light of the amendments deleting the references to claims, Applicants respectfully request that the objection to the Specification be withdrawn.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections of the pending claims.

Claim 25 is directed to a packet communication network comprising, inter alia, "a parallel network constituted by a plurality of physically or logically independent internal networks...at least one multiplexer...being connected to each of the internal networks in the parallel network and to the second external network and multiplexing packets received from a plurality of internal networks in the parallel network when outputting a multiplexed packet to the second external network."

With regard to Claim 25, the outstanding Office Action asserts that <u>Soininen</u> teaches every element except the multiplexer, as defined by Claim 25, which it asserts <u>Widegren</u> as teaching.

However, <u>Soininen</u> does not teach elements of Claim 25 for which it is asserted, and <u>Widegren</u> does not cure even the conceded deficiencies of <u>Soininen</u> with regard to Claim 25.

<u>Soininen</u> describes a communication system that can simultaneously communicate over a circuit-switched connection and a packet-switched connection. That is, one of the connection types that the communication system of <u>Soininen</u> can use is a packet-switched connection and the other is a circuit-switched connection or dedicated channel.

Thus, <u>Soininen</u> does not teach or suggest a <u>packet</u> communication network comprising a parallel network of a plurality of physically or logically independent internal networks at all but, instead, describes a communication system comprising a plurality of connections, only one of which is a packet-switched connection.

Further, with regard to the amendments to Claim 25 to further define the classifier,

Soininen is silent regarding "identifying a packet as a voice packet when a pair of a

transmission source address and a destination address as well as a destination port number are
equal to a pair of addresses between which a conversation is held by a voice service and
classifying the voice packet to a voice network among the internal networks," as recited by
amended Claim 1.

<u>Widegren</u> does not cure <u>Soininen</u>'s deficiencies with regard to a packet communication network comprising a parallel network constituted by a plurality of internal networks or a classifier identifying a packet as a voice packet.

<u>Widegren</u> describes a Universal Mobile Telephone communications System

Terrestrial Radio Access Network (UTRAN) that allows communication between external network service nodes, which interface with external networks, and mobile radios.

As described at column 2, line 49, to column 3, line 43, of <u>Widegren</u>, a service node wishing to communicate with a mobile radio requests a radio access bearer, rather than a radio channel resource, from the UTRAN. Each radio access bearer is associated with quality of service (QoS) parameters, and the UTRAN allocates each radio access bearer to physical transport or radio channel resources through the UTRAN and over the radio air interface, respectively. As shown at Fig. 4 and described at column 9, lines 5-63, of <u>Widegren</u>, "multiple bearers…may be multiplexed onto a single radio channel for transmission over the radio air interface and demultiplexed as needed at either end of the UTRAN."

Thus, <u>Widegren</u> fails to teach a plurality of internal networks, as defined by Claim 25, to cure the above-discussed deficiencies of <u>Soininen</u> and also fails to teach the multiplexer, as defined by Claim 25, to cure the conceded deficiencies of <u>Soininen</u>.

<u>Widegren</u> describes a single UTRAN, rather than a plurality of physically or logically independent internal networks. Further, <u>Widegren</u> describes that multiple bearers can be multiplexed in the transmission channel and demultiplexed by the UTRAN which communicates with the mobile radio, rather than a multiplexer "multiplexing packets received from a plurality of internal networks in the parallel network," as recited by Claim 25.

Because, even in combination, <u>Soininen</u> and <u>Widegren</u> fail to teach or suggest every element of amended Claim 25, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Amended Claim 38, though differing in scope and statutory class from Claim 25, patentably defines over the combination of <u>Soininen</u> and <u>Widegren</u> for similar reasons as those discussed above with regard to Claim 25. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 38 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Claims 26-37 depend from Claim 25, and Claims 39-50 depend from Claim 38. Thus, Claims 26-37 and 39-50 patentably define over <u>Soininen</u> and <u>Widegren</u> for at least the same reasons as Claims 25 and 38.

Further, Chaskar, Kekki, Brouwer, Boudreaux, Abrams, and Davis, which are additionally asserted against Claims 26-37 and 39-50, fail to cure the above-discussed deficiencies of Soininen and Widegren with regard to amended Claims 25 and 38 and are not asserted for the features discussed above as deficient in Soininen and Widegren. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of Claims 26-37 and 39-50 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Application No. 10/585,569 Reply to Office Action of October 15, 2009

Accordingly, the outstanding rejections are traversed and the pending claims are believed to be in condition for formal allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is, therefore, respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P.

Tel: (703) 413-3000 Fax: (703) 413 -2220 (OSMMN 07/09)

Customer Number

22850

James J. Kulbaski Attorney of Record Registration No. 34,648

Usha Munukutla-Parker Registration No. 61,939